DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 682 SP 036 022

AUTHOR Juul, Thomas P.
TITLE Boys, Girls, and Others: Affectional Differences between Self-Identified Lesbian, Gay Male, and Bisexual Public School Teachers in Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, and Identity.
PUB DATE 22 Apr 95
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995). For related paper, see SP 036 028.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Homosexuality; *Job Satisfaction; *Lesbianism; National Surveys; *Public School Teachers; Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Sexual Identity; Sexuality; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *Bisexuality; *Homosexual Teachers; Job Stress; Sexual Attitudes; Sexual Orientation

ABSTRACT

This study used data from a national survey to examine the relationship of openness regarding sexual orientation to job satisfaction, job stress, and identity for self-identified homosexual and bisexual public school teachers. A survey was sent to participants through national, state, and urban based gay teacher organizations. Of the 1,350 surveys sent out, 904 responses were returned. Heterosexual surveys returned were not used in the data analysis. A primary result of the study indicated that bisexuals have alaready established or are establishing a unified sexual identity, as bisexual, separate from heterosexual or homosexual identities and separate from gender assignments. Results also indicated that differences between affectional identity groups were found on all factors of job satisfaction. However, only three factors showed significant differences--security, students, and teaching itself. Lesbians were generally more satisfied with teaching, while bisexuals were the most dissatisfied. In regard to job stress, only "Identity Dissonance" indicated significant differences between affectional identities. Generally, lesbians were more stressed than gay males. However, bisexuals were the most stressed. In addition, gay males were significantly more likely to have gone public than either lesbians or bisexuals. The study raised questions regarding bisexual group identity that in turn led the study to question the use of the Kinsey Scale for determination of sexual identity or affectional orientation. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 682

American Education Research Association
Annual Meeting April 18-22, 1995
San Francisco, California

Session 53.11- Lesbian and Gay Studies/SIG Roundtables
Saturday April 22, 1995

Boys, Girls, and Others: Affectional Differences Between Self-Identified Lesbian, Gay Male, and Bisexual Public School Teachers In Job Satisfaction, Job Stress, and Identity

Dr. Thomas P. Juul

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. P Juul
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP036022

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Remarks

This study is an ancillary analyst taken from my dissertation data. The dissertation was a national survey of the relationship of openness to job satisfaction, job stress, and identity by lesbian, gay male, and bisexual public school teachers. The study had 904 respondents.

A primary result of this study indicates that bisexuals have, or are establishing a unified sexual identity, as bisexual, separate from heterosexual or homosexual identities. This sexual identity is separate from gender assignments. In addition, the study questions the use of the Kinsey Scale for determination of sexual identity. Rather, the study supports self-identification of sexual identity or affectional orientation.

Results indicated that differences between Affectional identity groups was found on all factors of a job satisfaction; however, only three factors showed significant differences, Security, Students, and Teaching Itself. Lesbians were generally more satisfied with teaching, while bisexuals were the most dissatisfied. In regard to job stress, only Identity Dissonance indicated significant differences between Affectional Identities. Generally, lesbians were more stressed than gay males; however, bisexuals were the most stressed. The greatest differences were found in the area of identity. The three groups showed significant difference in most areas of identity.

Methods and Techniques

Lesbian and/or gay male teacher organizations were contacted and asked to participate in a survey of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual teachers by distributing a survey on openness, job stress, and job satisfaction to their members, since obtaining membership lists was not possible. Twelve organizations agreed to participate in distributing the survey. These included three national, four state, and five urban based gay teacher organizations. The largest group was the Lesbian Teachers Network, which is headquartered in Iowa.

A four-section instrument was constructed. The sections included a general openness survey, the Identity-Disclosure Questionnaire (alpha .872), a job satisfaction survey (Lester's TJSQ) (Lester, 1982; 1983), a modified to included gay teacher specific stress items, Maslach Burnout Instrument (Maslach & Jackson, 1981a, 1981b)(alpha .838), and a demographic data section. The general openness and stress sections were pretested and factored using an urban lesbian and gay male population (N=193) before final modification and inclusion in the survey. The openness, job satisfaction, and job stress sections were re-factored using the gay teacher sample (N=895).

The survey packets contained two copies of the survey instrument, a cover letter, and return envelopes. By requesting the teacher who received the survey packet to pass along the second copy to a known lesbian, gay male, or bisexual teacher who was not a member of a gay teacher group the survey could be

snowballed, thereby enlarging the survey population and providing a sampling group not associated with a gay teacher organization.

Data

Thirteen hundred and fifty survey packets were sent to various gay teacher groups for distribution in the Spring of 1992. The researcher received 904 responses. Heterosexual surveys returned were not used in the data analysis.

Differences by Affectional Identity

A one-way analysis of variance was made between the three affectional identity groups on the TJSQ factor (see Table 1). Only three factors demonstrated significant differences in group means. The three factors were Students, Security, and Teaching. In all three instances, the differences were between lesbians and gay men. There were no significant mean differences among bisexuals. Lesbians were more satisfied than gay males in their relationships with students and attitudes toward teaching. Gay males were more satisfied with issues related to job security than lesbians. The Teaching factor had the lowest significant F probability (.002), while Security had the highest (.0492). While not statistically significant, bisexuals had the lowest mean scores on 8 of the 14 factors. Lesbians scored the lowest mean on only one factor, Colleagues, and tied with bisexuals for lowest means on Professional Development. Gay males had the lowest mean scores for the factors Pay, Students,

Table 1

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire Factors by Affectional Identity: 1) Lesbians, 2) Gay males, 3) Bisexuals

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Supervision	1	44.48	10.42	1.63	.1960
	2	45.42	9.89		
	3	43.40	10.05		
Colleagues	1	30.01	4.67	.68	.5086
	2	30.38	4.63		
	3	30.31	4.43		
Pay	1	20.28	6.02	1.88	.1537
	2	19.99	5.49		
	3	21.43	5.74		
Advancement	1	15.13	4.22	1.30	.2733
	2	15.25	4.12		
	3	14.38	3.80		
Working conditions	1	16.51	3.69	.50	.6044
	2	16.39	3.70		
	3	16.04	4.30		
Students[1]	1	16.73	2.01	4.11	.0167
	2	16.32	2.26		
	3	16.38	1.74		
Profess. develop.	1	9.70	2.47	.57	.5647
	2	9.88	2.28		
	3	9.70	2.25		
Creativity	1	17.07	2.52	2.02	.1335
	2	16.76	2.36		
	3	16.66	2.61		

Table 1

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire Factors by Affectional Identity: 1) Lesbians, 2) Gay males, 3) Bisexuals

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Recognition	1	13.55	3.25	.33	.7195
	2	13.37	3.25		
	3	13.40	3.07		
Security[2]	1	10.88	2.55	3.02	.0492
	2	11.28	2.42		
	3	10.80	2.65		
School policies	1	8.56	1.23	1.33	.2656
	2	8.44	1.36		
	3	8.36	1.08		
Teaching[3]	1	13.50	1.70	6.23	.0020
	2	13.08	1.85		
	3	13.11	1.76		
Admin. policies	1	5.93	2.22	.46	.6304
	2	5.81	2.09		
	3	5.76	1.85		
Personal respons.	1	12.73	1.73	.84	.4331
	2	12.60	1.72		
	3	12.51	1.68		

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

[1] Gay Males & Lesbians
[2] Lesbians & Gay Males
[3] Gay Males & Lesbians

Recognition, and Teaching. These factors are considered core issues in teaching. Lesbians had the highest mean scores on seven factors. Bisexual had the highest mean score on the factor Pay. Gay males had the highest means on four factors: Supervision, Colleagues, Advancement, and Security. The results appear to indicate differences between affectional identity groups across all areas of job satisfaction, although only a few were statistically significant. One apparent conflict between gay male job satisfaction issues is notable. Gay males are the most satisfied with Supervision and least satisfied with Recognition and Teaching. Gay males were the most satisfied with opportunities for Advancement while being most dissatisfied with Pay. Lesbians seem generally more satisfied with their jobs. The non-significant differences with means of gay men in Supervision, Advancement, and Security may be the result of age and tenure differences between the groups. Bisexuals were clearly the least satisfied group.

A similar analysis of variance was made with the Level of Professional Challenge Questionnaire (stress)(see Table 2). High scores on the factors Emotional Exhaustion, Identity Dissonance, and Depersonalization indicate higher levels of burnout. A high score on Personal Accomplishment indicates a lower degree of burnout. The results indicated only one factor, Identity Dissonance, had significantly different group means. The mean for gay men was lower and was significantly different than either the lesbian or the bisexual means. While not statistically

Table 2

One-Way analysis of Variance of Level of Professional Challenge Questionnaire by Affectional Identity: 1) Lesbians, 2) Gay males, 3) Bisexuals

Factors	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Emotional Exhaustion	1	23.96	11.41	1.63	.1968
	2	23.89	11.48		
	3	26.49	9.91		
Identity Dissonance[1]	1	27.38	14.08	13.27	.0000
	2	22.97	13.42		
	3	30.53	11.97		
Personal accomp.	1	40.17	6.20	2.55	.0781
	2	39.15	6.68		
	3	39.89	5.84		
Depersonal-ization	1	6.83	5.40	2.68	.0683
	2	7.73	5.55		
	3	7.38	5.51		

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05

[1] Gay Males & Lesbians; Gay Males & Bisexuals

significant, the mean differences for the factors Personal Accomplishment and Depersonalization approached significance. In both cases the mean for gay men was higher than the mean for lesbians by a point. Bisexuals had the middle means on these two factors. On the Emotional Exhaustion and Identity Dissonance factors, bisexuals had markedly higher scores than either lesbians or gay males. Lesbians experienced a greater sense of personal accomplishment, less depersonalization of students, and less emo-

tional exhaustion than gay males and bisexuals. Gay males experience far less stress related to sexual orientation than either lesbians or bisexuals. Bisexuals experienced more Emotional Exhaustion and Identity Dissonance than either lesbians or gay males. Affectional Identity appears to effect job burnout and stress across all dimensions, however it is a significant force only as it applies to matters associated with sexual orientation at work.

It is an assumption, held by many, that lesbians and gay men are similar in the various emphases they place on aspects of their sexual identity. The idea of differences in emphasis on aspects of identity is not in opposition to the commonality of experience and identity development stages, rather it is an examination which highlights variations which may provide a perspective on interpreting survey results. To this end, a one-way analysis of variance was made using the Identity-Disclosure Questionnaire (IDQ) by Affectional Identity. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 3. The result indicate that lesbians and gay men are similar to each other and different from bisexuals when the entire instrument is considered (IDQTOT). Affectional identity groups perceived various factors of identity differently. There were significant mean difference on all six factors.

As one might expect, bisexuals had the lowest mean scores on all six factors. Lesbians had high mean scores on four of the six factors, Identity Integration, Separatism, Commitment, and

Table 3

One-Way Analysis of Identity-Disclosure Questionnaire Factors and Total by Affectional Identity: 1) Lesbians, 2) Gay males, 3) Bisexuals

Factor	Gp	Mean	SD	F	Prob.
Going public[1]	1	26.17	8.14	9.64	.0001
	2	28.23	8.05		
	3	24.74	6.48		
Identity integration[2]	1	21.75	4.54	3.39	.0340
	2	21.61	4.63		
	3	20.24	4.05		
Exposure[3]	1	16.19	3.24	4.46	.0118
	2	16.46	3.20		
	3	15.21	3.76		
Separatism[4]	1	13.09	3.12	31.61	.0000
	2	11.53	2.95		
	3	11.21	3.05		
Commitment[5]	1	13.72	1.77	21.82	.0000
	2	12.97	2.35		
	3	12.32	2.26		
Identity acceptance[6]	1	17.92	2.08	29.75	.0000
	2	17.23	2.59		
	3	15.66	3.06		
IDQTOT[7]	1	118.50	16.36	6.76	.0012
	2	117.57	17.18		
	3	110.65	16.28		

Table 3

One-Way Analysis of Identity-Disclosure Questionnaire Factors and Total by Affectional Identity: 1) Lesbians, 2) Gay males, 3) Bisexuals

Pairs of groups significantly different @ .05	
[1]	Bisexuals & Gay Men; Lesbians & Gay Men
[2]	Bisexuals & Gay Men; Bisexuals & Lesbians
[3]	Bisexuals & Lesbians; Bisexuals & Gay Men
[4]	Bisexuals & Lesbians; Gay Men & Lesbians
[5]	Bisexuals & Gay Men; Bisexuals & Lesbians; Gay Men & Lesbians
[6]	Bisexuals & Gay Men; Bisexuals & Lesbians; Gay Men & Lesbians
[7]	Bisexuals & Gay Men; Bisexuals & Lesbians

Note: IDQ total, Identity Disclosure Questionnaire

Identity Acceptance. Gay males had the highest mean scores on two factors, Going Public and Exposure. Gay men were significantly more likely to have gone public than either lesbians or bisexuals. However, there was no significant difference between bisexuals and lesbians; the gender imbalance difference in the bisexual Affectional Identity group may explain the lack of differences between lesbians and bisexuals. Responses of bisexuals indicate that they are significantly different from lesbians and gay males in their identity integration; however, there were no differences between lesbians and gay males. Bisexuals were also significantly less likely to disclose their affectional identity than either lesbians or gay men. This supports the scores found in the relationships section of the survey. Separatism was a significantly held value among lesbians as compared to gay men. On the factors Commitment and

Identity Acceptance, all groups were significantly different from each other. On the IDQ, Lesbians had a higher total score which was not significantly different from the score for gay men. Bisexuals had the lowest total score which was significantly different from that of lesbians or gay men. The results indicate that lesbians and gay men perceive aspects of identity differently. The results also indicate that bisexuals are distinctive in their sexual identities.

This analysis was performed to contrast variations in emphasis on aspects of identity. It provides perspectives for interpreting survey results. The lack of any significant difference between lesbians and gay men in the IDQ total score supports the similarities in experience and identity from a social perspective. Differences demonstrate diversity not disharmony. For example, lesbian separatism has been noted by several researchers, however in the case of lesbian teachers, it may be a function of being in relationships more often than men, and therefore, having to keep more separate in order to protect themselves. Lesbians are also less likely to be tenured. Results demonstrate the need for more research on identity formation.

Bisexuals - Gender Differences

A question arises about the bisexual component of this study, how similar are the men and women who compose this sub-group? Do bisexuals of unlike genders have commonly held

attitudes, or has the numerical dominance of the female bisexuals been the primary source of bisexual difference found in the results. The study has shown significant differences between lesbians, gay males, and bisexuals, which is an indicator of some group cohesiveness. It is the view of this researcher that bisexuals are a unique and separate sexual orientation or sub-population. While Kinsey indicated a continuum of sexuality from heterosexuality to homosexuality with numerous variations, there exists a group of individuals who identify themselves as bisexual, in the same way as gays or straights perceive themselves. From the social constructionist view, one could say, the public identity process and acceptance for a bisexual identity is underway. For the purposes of this research, a t-test using TJSQ, LPCQ, and IDQ factors was conducted to determine whether a consensus existed among bisexuals, or whether results were obtained by gender domination.

The returned surveys contained 71 self-identified bisexual individuals, 51 female and 20 male (IDQ27). The original intent of the researcher was to use the Kinsey scale to distinguish among sexual orientations; however, many individuals in the Kinsey group 4, (predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual) considered themselves to be bisexual. It was determined that a better indicator was item IDQ27, which asked if the individual considered himself or herself to be bisexual, ie. self-identification (see Table 4).

Table 4

Cross Tabulation of IDQ27 by Kinsey Scale

Kinsey	St. agree	Agree	Neut.	Dis-agree	St. dis.	Tot Per
1		1				1 .1
2	2	3	2		2	9 1.0
3	7	2	1	1		11 1.3
4	6	23	9	14	3	55 6.3
5	1	18	33	78	55	185 21.3
6		4	17	76	512	609 70.0
Tot	16	51	62	169	572	870
Per	1.8	5.9	7.1	19.4	65.7	100.0

Note: IDQ27, "I am bisexual."

As can be seen in Table 4, the two approaches to defining bisexuals produced very dissimilar groupings. Using the Kinsey group 2 (Predominately heterosexual, but more incidentally homosexual) and group 3 (Equally heterosexual and homosexual) indicates 20 individuals who would be considered bisexual. Of these 20 individuals, three do not define themselves (in terms of the IDQ27) as bisexual and three are unresolved in their affectional identity as bisexual. The entire category of neutrals presents a unique situation of unresolved individuals who find themselves defined homosexuals on the Kinsey scale and yet do not reject the bisexual label. This is especially clear

with the Kinsey's group five, who would be clearly defined as homosexual, yet are neutral when asked if they consider themselves bisexual. The exclusive use of the Kinsey scale to distinguish between sexual identities is clearly questionable. With the emergence of a bisexual identity, the Kinsey scale may be dated.

Results of the t-test for bisexuals by gender indicates that self-identified bisexuals generally hold similar views on job satisfaction and job stress regardless of gender (see Table 5). On the TJSQ factors there were only two significant differences in means. These were for the factors Administrative Policies and Personal Responsibility. For both factors when means were compared with early Affectional Identity results, the mean score on the t-test for bisexual men was much lower than for gay men and for the mean bisexual scores on the TJSQ. Bisexual women scored higher than lesbians on these factors (see Table 1). The factor Professional Development approached significance at the .054 level. Here again, bisexual males scored well below the bisexual mean for the factor, while bisexual women scored considerably above the mean for lesbians. These three factors were not significant in the one-way analysis of variance by Affectional Identity. On the factor Security, both means were the same. On the LPCQ there were no significant differences in mean scores by gender. Scores for women were higher, in general, than the scores for men. Bisexual men showed a much higher score on Depersonalization than bisexual women. Bisexual women were

Table 5

Bisexuals, Teacher Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Challenge Factors by Gender: 1) Women, 2) Men

Factors TJSQ	Gp	Mean	T-value	Prob.
Supervision	1	44.68	1.72	.095
	2	40.20		
Colleagues	1	30.24	-.22	.824
	2	30.50		
Pay	1	21.48	.13	.900
	2	21.30		
Advancement	1	14.58	.73	.470
	2	13.90		
Wk conditions	1	16.06	.05	.959
	2	16.00		
Students	1	16.30	-.40	.690
	2	16.50		
Prof.devel.	1	10.04	2.00	.054
	2	8.85		
Creativity	1	16.76	.47	.641
	2	16.40		
Recognition	1	13.52	.48	.636
	2	13.10		
Security	1	10.80	.00	1.00
	2	10.80		
School policy	1	8.42	.65	.522
	2	8.20		
Teaching	1	13.18	.55	.584
	2	12.95		

Table 5

Bisexuals, Teacher Job Satisfaction and Level of Professional Challenge Factors by Gender: 1) Women, 2) Men

Factors TJSQ	Gp	Mean	T-value	Prob.
Admin. policy	1	6.04	2.19	.034
	2	5.05		
Per. respon.	1	12.78	2.05	.048
	2	11.85		
Factors LPCQ				
Emotional exhaustion	1	26.50	.01	.992
	2	26.47		
Identity dissonance	1	30.73	.19	.850
	2	30.00		
Personal accomp.	1	40.23	.58	.567
	2	39.10		
Depersonal-ization	1	6.89	-1.01	.323
	2	8.55		

more satisfied with their job than bisexual men. Bisexual women displayed higher Emotional Exhaustion and Identity Dissonance than bisexual men. Bisexual men exhibited greater Depersonalization and lower Personal Accomplishment than bisexual women.

The IDQ showed no significant differences between the gender means. With the exception of Going Public, women had higher scores than men on all factors. The IDQ total score reflects this cumulative effect, although it is not statistically

Table 6

Bisexuals, Identity Disclosure Factors
by Gender: 1) Women, 2) Men

Factor	Gp	Mean	T-value	Prob.
Going public	1	24.62	- .26	.796
	2	25.05		
Integration	1	20.72	1.67	.104
	2	19.00		
Exposure	1	15.35	.46	.649
	2	14.85		
Separatism	1	11.43	.94	.356
	2	10.65		
Commitment	1	12.49	.96	.345
	2	11.90		
Acceptance	1	16.03	1.63	.113
	2	14.70		
IDQTOT	1	111.92	1.03	.310
	2	107.40		

Note: IDQTOT, Identity Disclosure Questionnaire Total

significant. In the case of Identity Acceptance, women showed a better acceptance of their bisexual identity by more than a point. The indication is that bisexuals regardless of gender have similar profiles as provided by the IDQ factors and IDQ total score; however, bisexual women are slightly more adjusted to their bisexual identities (see Table 6).

There were gender differences on some demographic variables (see Table 7). Female bisexuals were five years younger than male bisexuals. The bisexual women had been teaching for an

average of 12.3 years, while the teaching experience for the bisexual men was 21 years. The difference for years in present school was significant in that bisexual women had approximately 7 years in their schools, while male bisexuals averaged 13.5 years. Bisexual men were significantly more likely to be tenured than bisexual women. The men had also experienced significantly more AIDS related deaths.

Table 7

Bisexuals, Significant Demographic Variables by Gender: 1) Women, 2) Men

Variable	Gp	Means	T-value	Prob.
Age	1	40.37	-2.55	.015
	2	45.95		
Experience	1	12.33	-3.99	.000
	2	21.20		
Yrs school	1	6.90	-3.30	.002
	2	13.50		
Tenured	1	1.40	3.06	.003
	2	1.10		
Death of friends	1	1.86	3.33	.003
	2	1.45		
Relationship	1	1.35	-1.88	.068
	2	1.60		

There was no significant difference in being in a committed relationship, although women were more likely to be in a

relationship. Membership in gay teacher organizations or gay civil rights groups showed no significant differences, nor did marriage or children.

Civil rights protection by state, local ordinances, or contract showed no significant differences. The three global attitude questions showed no differences. Only the death of friends to AIDS showed significant differences. In openness to family members or administrators, there were no significant differences. In summary, bisexual women and men were similar on job satisfaction, job stress, and identity- disclosure factors. While significant differences existed in chronological variables, there were no significant differences across the other variables found in the demographic data section or on the relationship sections of the survey. This lack of significant differences is striking in that the research indicates that chronological factors, such as age, should have some impact on job satisfaction, job related stress, and identity.

Bibliography

Hammersmith, S. K., & Weinberg, M. S. (1973). Homosexual identity: Commitment, adjustment, and significant others. Sociometry, 36(1), 56-79.

Lester, P. E. (1982). Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. (Available from Dr. P. E. Lester, C.W. Post University, Old Westbury, NY).

_____. (1983) Development of an instrument to measure teacher job satisfaction. unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1981a). Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

_____. (1981b). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.

DEFINITION OF FACTORS: MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY AND IDENTITY DISSONANCE

1. The Emotional Exhaustion subscale assesses feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work.

2. The Depersonalization subscale measures unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipients of ones service, care, treatment, or instruction.

3. The Person Accomplishment subscale assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people.

4. The Identity Dissonance subscale assesses feelings of stress related to a gay and bisexual sexual identity in the work environment.

DEFINITION OF FACTORS: TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Definition of eight factors of Teacher Job Satisfaction

Questionnaire from Lester (1982) Teacher Job Satisfaction

Questionnaire Manual (*), and six from survey factor analysis.

1. Administrative policies - Teachers attitudes towards the ability of the district administration to communicate its policies.

2. Advancement - The opportunity for promotion.*

3. Colleagues - The work group and social interaction among fellow teachers.*

4. Creativity - The opportunity to use new methods and skills.

5. Pay - Annual Income.*

6. Personal responsibility - The opportunity to be accountable for one's own work.*.

7. Professional Development - Attitudes towards suggestions for improving teaching from colleagues and supervisors.

8. Recognition - Some act of notice, blame, praise, or criticism.*

9. School policies - Awareness of and interest in school level polices.

10. Security - The school's policies regarding tenure, seniority, layoffs, pension, retirement, and dismissal.*

11. Students - Interaction with students.

12. Supervision - The task-oriented behavior and person-oriented behavior of the immediate supervisor.*

13. Teaching attitudes - feelings towards teaching itself.

14. Working Conditions - The working environment and aspects of the physical environment.*

DEFINITION OF FACTORS:
IDENTITY-DISCLOSURE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Going Public - reflects the highest level of identity, represented by public exposure.

2. Integration - a "willingness to expose" yourself; the factor represents a middle level of identity.

3. Exposure - items indicate the acceptance or rejection of an early stage in identity development.

4. Separatism - homo-social in nature.

5. Commitment - positive commitment to a deviant identity, from Hammersmith and Weinberg.

6. Acceptance - a basic level of identity acceptance.